

Internal distribution code:

- (A) Publication in OJ
(B) To Chairmen and Members
(C) To Chairmen
(D) No distribution

**Datasheet for the decision
of 1 July 2008**

Case Number: T 1961/07 - 3.3.04

Application Number: 96925884.7

Publication Number: 0841937

IPC: A61K 38/17

Language of the proceedings: EN

Title of invention:

Use of betaglycan to reduce scarring

Patentee:

Renovo Limited

Opponent:

GENZYME CORPORATION

Headword:

Genzyme/USE OF BETAGLYCAN

Relevant legal provisions:

EPC Art. 108
EPC R. 101(1)

Relevant legal provisions (EPC 1973):

-

Keyword:

"Admissible appeal - (no)"

Decisions cited:

-

Catchword:

-



Case Number: T 1961/07 - 3.3.04

D E C I S I O N
of the Technical Board of Appeal 3.3.04
of 1 July 2008

Appellant:
(Opponent)

GENZYME CORPORATION
500 Kendall Street
Cambridge
MA 02142 (US)

Representative:

Meier, Jürgen
Vossius & Partner
Siebertstrasse 4
D-81675 München (DE)

Respondent:
(Patent Proprietor)

Renovo Limited
Manchester Incubator Building
48 Grafton Street
Manchester M13 9XX (GB)

Representative:

Atkinson, Peter Birch
MARKS & CLERK
Sussex House
83-85 Mosley Street
Manchester M2 3LG (GB)

Decision under appeal:

Interlocutory decision of the Opposition
Division of the European Patent Office posted
24 September 2007 concerning maintenance of
European patent No. 0841937 in amended form.

Composition of the Board:

Chair: U. Kinkeldey
Members: R. Gramaglia
D. S. Rogers

Summary of Facts and Submissions

- I. The appeal contests the interlocutory decision of the Opposition Division of the European Patent Office posted on 24 September 2007 concerning maintenance of European patent No. 841937 in amended form.

The Appellant (Opponent) filed a notice of appeal on 4 December 2007 and paid the fee for appeal on the same day.

No statement of grounds was filed. The notice of appeal contains nothing that could be regarded as a statement of grounds pursuant to Article 108 EPC.

- II. In a communication dated 19 March 2008 sent by registered letter with advice of delivery, the Registry of the Board informed the Appellant that no statement of grounds had been filed and that the appeal could be expected to be rejected as inadmissible.
- III. By letter dated 21 May 2008 the Appellant confirmed, that the request for oral proceedings was not intended to apply to the question of inadmissibility of the appeal.

Reasons for the Decision

As no written statement setting out the grounds of appeal has been filed, the appeal has to be rejected as inadmissible (Article 108 EPC in conjunction with Rule 101(1) EPC)

Order

For these reasons it is decided that:

The appeal is rejected as inadmissible.

The Registrar:

The Chair:

C. Eickhoff

U. Kinkeldey